UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/783,760 | 02/20/2004 | Yulun Wang | 157438-0006 | 7411 |

1622 7590 12/26/2007

IRELL & MANELLA LLP
840 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE
SUITE 400
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| KISWANTO, NICHOLAS | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 3664 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 12/26/2007 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/783,760 | WANG ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Nicholas Kiswanto | 3664 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 September 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-66* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-66* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *23 June 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

KHOI H. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenke (6,256,556), in view of De Smet (6,321,137).

As to claim 1, Zenke/556 shows a robot system (abstract), comprising: a first remote station 20 that can access a robot 1; and a second remote station 10 that includes an arbitrator 29 that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations. However, Zenke/556 is silent as to the specifics of a camera and monitor on said robot.

De Smet/137 shows the commonly well-known robot system that includes a camera 36 and a monitor 26.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with the teaching of De Smet/137 since a camera would be useful to an operator to see the precision of robot and a monitor would be useful for communicating with the repair technician of Zenke/556.

As to claim 11, Zenke/556 further shows a robot system (abstract), comprising:

a first remote station 20 that can access a robot 1; and, a second remote station 10 that includes arbitration means 29 for controlling access to said robot by said first and second remote stations.

However, Zenke/556 is silent as to the specifics of a camera and monitor on said robot.

De Smet/137 shows the commonly well-known robot system that includes a camera 36 and a monitor 26.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with the teaching of De Smet/137 since a camera would be useful to an operator to see the precision of robot and a monitor would be useful for communicating with the repair technician of Zenke/556.

As to claim 21, Zenke/556 shows a robot system (abstract), comprising: a first remote station 20 that can access a mobile robot 1; and a second remote station 10 that includes an arbitrator 29 that can control access to said mobile robot by said first and second remote stations. However, Zenke/556 is silent as to the specifics of a camera and monitor on said robot.

De Smet/137 shows the commonly well-known robot system that includes a camera 36 and a monitor 26.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with the teaching of De Smet/137 since a camera would be useful to an operator to see the precision of robot and a monitor would be useful for communicating with the repair technician of Zenke/556.

As to claim 31, Zenke/556 shows a robot system (abstract), comprising: a broadband network 40; a first remote station 10 that can access a robot 1 through said broadband network; and a second remote station 20 that includes an arbitrator 29 that can control access to said robot by said first and second remote stations. However, Zenke/556 is silent as to the specifics of a camera and monitor on said robot.

De Smet/137 shows the commonly well-known robot system that includes a camera 36 and a monitor 26.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with the teaching of De Smet/137 since a camera would be useful to an operator to see the precision of robot and a monitor would be useful for communicating with the repair technician of Zenke/556.

As to claim 41, Zenke/556 shows a robot system (abstract), comprising: a broadband network 40; a first remote station 10 that can access a robot 1 through said broadband network; and a second remote station 20 that includes an arbitrator 29 that can control access to said robot by said first and second

remote stations. However, Zenke/556 is silent as to the specifics of a camera and monitor on said robot.

De Smet/137 shows the commonly well-known robot system that includes a camera 36 and a monitor 26.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with the teaching of De Smet/137 since a camera would be useful to an operator to see the precision of robot and a monitor would be useful for communicating with the repair technician of Zenke/556.

As to claim 51, Zenke/556 shows a robot system (abstract), comprising: a broadband network 40; a first remote station 10 that can access a robot 1 through said broadband network; and a second remote station 20 that includes an arbitrator 29 that can control access to said robot by said first and second remote stations. However, Zenke/556 is silent as to the specifics of a camera and monitor on said robot.

De Smet/137 shows the commonly well-known robot system that includes a camera 36 and a monitor 26.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with the teaching of De Smet/137 since a camera would be useful to an operator to see the precision of robot and a monitor would be useful for communicating with the repair technician of Zenke/556.

3. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-16, 18-20, 22-26, 28-30, 32-36, 38-40, 42-46, 48-50, 52-56, 58-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenke/556, in view of De Smet/137, further in view of Ben-Shachar et al. (2001/0010053).

As to claim 2, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a notification mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 shows the commonly well-known teaching of a notification mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a notification mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it has been given priority.

As to claim 3, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a timeout mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a timeout mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0156].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a timeout mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053

since a controller must have a way to relinquish control in the event a malfunction renders it unresponsive.

As to claim 4, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a queue mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a queue mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0145].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a queue mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to reserve its request in case another controller currently has control.

As to claim 5, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a call back mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a call back mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a call back mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it can take control.

As to claim 6, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a priority mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a priority mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0054].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a priority mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since the system needs a way to know which controller obtains control in case more than one controller requests control simultaneously.

As to claim 8, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of an exclusive and sharing mode.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of an exclusive and sharing mode [0096].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with an exclusive and sharing mode as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since there are times when both modes are necessary.

As to claim 9, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 - 11).

As to claim 10, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 6, line 52 – 55).

As to claim 12, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a notification means in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 shows the commonly well-known teaching of a notification means within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a notification means as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it has been given priority.

As to claim 13, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a timeout mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a timeout mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0156].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a timeout mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053

since a controller must have a way to relinquish control in the event a malfunction renders it unresponsive.

As to claim 14, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a queue mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a queue mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0145].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a queue mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to reserve its request in case another controller currently has control.

As to claim 15, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a call back mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a call back mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a call back mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it can take control.

As to claim 16, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a priority mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a priority mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0054].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a priority mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since the system needs a way to know which controller obtains control in case more than one controller requests control simultaneously.

As to claim 18, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of an exclusive and sharing mode.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of an exclusive and sharing mode [0096].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with an exclusive and sharing mode as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since there are times when both modes are necessary.

As to claim 19, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 - 11).

As to claim 20, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 6, line 52 – 55).

As to claim 22, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a notification mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 shows the commonly well-known teaching of a notification mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a notification mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it has been given priority.

As to claim 23, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a timeout mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a timeout mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0156].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a timeout mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053

since a controller must have a way to relinquish control in the event a malfunction renders it unresponsive.

As to claim 24, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a queue mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a queue mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0145].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a queue mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to reserve its request in case another controller currently has control.

As to claim 25, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a call back mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a call back mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a call back mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it can take control.

As to claim 26, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a priority mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a priority mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0054].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a priority mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since the system needs a way to know which controller obtains control in case more than one controller requests control simultaneously.

As to claim 28, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of an exclusive and sharing mode.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of an exclusive and sharing mode [0096].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with an exclusive and sharing mode as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since there are times when both modes are necessary.

As to claim 29, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 - 11).

As to claim 30, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 6, line 52 – 55).

As to claim 32, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a notification mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 shows the commonly well-known teaching of a notification mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a notification mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it has been given priority.

As to claim 33, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a timeout mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a timeout mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0156].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a timeout mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053

since a controller must have a way to relinquish control in the event a malfunction renders it unresponsive.

As to claim 34, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a queue mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a queue mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0145].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a queue mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to reserve its request in case another controller currently has control.

As to claim 35, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a call back mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a call back mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a call back mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it can take control.

As to claim 36, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a priority mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a priority mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0054].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a priority mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since the system needs a way to know which controller obtains control in case more than one controller requests control simultaneously.

As to claim 38, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of an exclusive and sharing mode.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of an exclusive and sharing mode [0096].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with an exclusive and sharing mode as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since there are times when both modes are necessary.

As to claim 39, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 - 11).

As to claim 40, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 6, line 52 – 55).

As to claim 42, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a notification mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 shows the commonly well-known teaching of a notification mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a notification mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it has been given priority.

As to claim 43, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a timeout mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a timeout mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0156].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a timeout mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053

since a controller must have a way to relinquish control in the event a malfunction renders it unresponsive.

As to claim 44, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a queue mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a queue mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0145].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a queue mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to reserve its request in case another controller currently has control.

As to claim 45, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a call back mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a call back mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a call back mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it can take control.

As to claim 46, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a priority mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a priority mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0054].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a priority mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since the system needs a way to know which controller obtains control in case more than one controller requests control simultaneously.

As to claim 48, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of an exclusive and sharing mode.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of an exclusive and sharing mode [0096].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with an exclusive and sharing mode as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since there are times when both modes are necessary.

As to claim 49, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 - 11).

As to claim 50, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 6, line 52 – 55).

As to claim 52, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a notification mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 shows the commonly well-known teaching of a notification mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a notification mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it has been given priority.

As to claim 53, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a timeout mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a timeout mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0156].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a timeout mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053

since a controller must have a way to relinquish control in the event a malfunction renders it unresponsive.

As to claim 54, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a queue mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a queue mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0145].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a queue mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to reserve its request in case another controller currently has control.

As to claim 55, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a call back mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a call back mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0107].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a call back mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since a controller must have a way to know when it can take control.

As to claim 56, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of a priority mechanism in the arbitrator.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of a priority mechanism within a device with multiple controllers [0054].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with a priority mechanism as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since the system needs a way to know which controller obtains control in case more than one controller requests control simultaneously.

As to claim 58, Zenke/556 and De Smet/137 disclose the claimed invention as described above. However, they are silent as to the specifics of an exclusive and sharing mode.

Ben-Shachar/053 further shows the commonly well-known teaching of an exclusive and sharing mode [0096].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide Zenke/556's invention with an exclusive and sharing mode as taught by Ben-Shachar/053 since there are times when both modes are necessary.

As to claim 59, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station transmits a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said second remote station (col 7, line 4 - 11).

As to claim 60, Zenke/556 further shows wherein said first remote station sends a communication for said mobile robot that is initially transmitted to said mobile robot (col 6, line 52 – 55).

As to claims 61 - 66, Zenke/556 further shows that robot is mobile (col 1, line 11 – 12, Fig. 1).

4. Claims 7, 17, 27, 37, 47, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenke/556, in view of De Smet/137, further in view of Ben-Shachar/053, further in view of Roy et al. ("Towards Personal Service Robots for the Elderly").

As to claim 7, Zenke/556, De Smet/137, and Ben-Shachar/053 disclose the claimed invention as described above. Zenke/556 further shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 - 32).

However it is silent as to the specifics of priority classifications of doctor, caregiver, or family member.

Roy shows a robot system wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second Paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the teaching of Roy to Zenke/556's invention in order to expand its uses into other fields.

As to claim 17, Zenke/556, De Smet/137, and Ben-Shachar/053 disclose the claimed invention as described above. Zenke/556 further shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 - 32).

However it is silent as to the specifics of priority classifications of doctor, caregiver, or family member.

Roy shows a robot system wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second Paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the teaching of Roy to Zenke/556's invention in order to expand its uses into other fields.

As to claim 27, Zenke/556, De Smet/137, and Ben-Shachar/053 disclose the claimed invention as described above. Zenke/556 further shows wherein

said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 - 32).

However it is silent as to the specifics of priority classifications of doctor, caregiver, or family member.

Roy shows a robot system wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second Paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the teaching of Roy to Zenke/556's invention in order to expand its uses into other fields.

As to claim 37, Zenke/556, De Smet/137, and Ben-Shachar/053 disclose the claimed invention as described above. Zenke/556 further shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 - 32).

However it is silent as to the specifics of priority classifications of doctor, caregiver, or family member.

Roy shows a robot system wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second Paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the teaching of Roy to Zenke/556's invention in order to expand its uses into other fields.

As to claim 47, Zenke/556, De Smet/137, and Ben-Shachar/053 disclose the claimed invention as described above. Zenke/556 further shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 - 32).

However it is silent as to the specifics of priority classifications of doctor, caregiver, or family member.

Roy shows a robot system wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second Paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the teaching of Roy to Zenke/556's invention in order to expand its uses into other fields.

As to claim 57, Zenke/556, De Smet/137, and Ben-Shachar/053 disclose the claimed invention as described above. Zenke/556 further shows wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a local user or a service user (col 6, line 11 - 32).

However it is silent as to the specifics of priority classifications of doctor, caregiver, or family member.

Roy shows a robot system wherein said remote stations may be given priority as a doctor (page 1, last paragraph), caregiver (page 3, second paragraph), or family member (page 3, second Paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the teaching of Roy to Zenke/556's invention in order to expand its uses into other fields.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1- 66 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Kiswanto whose telephone number is (571) 270-3269. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8AM - 5PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on (571) 272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nicholas Kiswanto
November 19, 2007

KHOI H. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER